



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/810,214

03/26/2004

Lisa M. Fisher

204111-1 (5024-00337)

8398

26753 7590 12/03/2008
ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP
100 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE, SUITE 1100
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202

EXAMINER

PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2164

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/03/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's Amendment filed on 9/30/2008 with amended claim 1 and canceled claim 2. In this Office Action, claims 1, 3-25 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1, 3-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bianco et al. (USPA Pub. 2002/0082865A1) hereinafter Bianco, in view of Miyamoto

(Japan Patent JP02002027386A) hereinafter Miyamoto and further in view of Slatter et al. (US Patent 6,796,489). Hereinafter Slatter.

4. As per independent claims 1 and 14, Bianco teaches the electronically displaying files include a single electronically displayable file including a treatment pathway timeline display (page 2, paragraph [0017]). Bianco teaches the claimed, an electronic document manager including an electronic image file database for storing the electronic image files in response to the set of executed instructions (Fig. 2B, page 5, paragraph [0089]). Bianco teaches the claimed, a task engine configured in the storage medium, wherein the electronic document manager is configured to send the electronic image file events to the task manager, the task manager configured for generating a set of tasks related to the electronic image files based on the contents of said electronic image file events in response to the set of executed instructions (Fig. 2A, page 5, paragraph [0087]). Bianco teaches the claimed, a storage medium including a set of instructions (page 3, paragraph [0023]). Bianco teaches the claimed, a processor configured to execute the set of instructions (page 13, paragraph [0139]).

Bianco does not teach generating an electronic image file events. However, Miyamoto teaches the claimed “generating electronic image file events related to the set of EIF batches” as the personal computer 2 (Fig. 1) generates a meta-data file corresponding to the image data file (S105). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Miyamoto’s teachings would have

allowed Bianco's method to manage separately electronic image files and their metadata files.

Bianco and Miyamoto do not explicitly teach using a scanning device application for electronic image files. However, Slatter teaches the claimed, a scanning device application configured to extract a set of EIF batches from the electronic image files (Fig. 1, col. 6, lines 29-35). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Slatter's teachings would have allowed Bianco's systems and methods to allow electronic documents that are digitally signed to be validated, processed and/or recorded (col. 2, lines 19-21).

Bianco teaches the claimed, task engine further comprises a task generator including an event manager for storing said electronic image file events, a rule set manager including at least one predetermined set of rules, each of said rules having at least one predetermined condition, and a task generation manager for comparing the electronic image file events to said at least one predetermined set of rules and generating one or more tasks if the electronic image file events meet said at least one predetermined condition (Fig. 4, page 6, paragraph [0092]).

5. As per dependent claims 3 and 15, Bianco teaches the claimed, task engine module further comprises predetermined task instructions for working each of the tasks generated that relate to the electronic image files (Fig. 2B, page 5, paragraph [0089]).

6. As per dependent claims 4 and 16, Bianco teaches the claimed, task instructions include a predetermined workflow (Fig. 2B, page 5, paragraph [0089]).

7. As per dependent claims 5 and 17, Bianco teaches the claimed, task instructions include means for linking to said electronic document manager (Fig. 4, page 6, paragraph [0094]).

8. As per dependent claims 6 and 18, Bianco teaches the claimed, linking allow the electronic image files stored in said database to be viewed in said task engine (Fig. 1, page 5, paragraph [0084]).

9. As per dependent claims 7 and 19, Bianco teaches the claimed, linking include a button control and a hypertext link (Fig. 5, page 7, paragraph [0102]).

10. As per dependent claims 8 and 20, Bianco and Miyamoto combined teaches claim 1 and 14. Bianco does not explicitly teach sorting or filtering electronic documents. However, Miyamoto teaches the claimed, electronic document manager includes one or more method modules for sorting or filtering particular groups of electronic image files and said means for linking is used to execute said one or more method modules (abstract). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of

the cited references because Miyamoto's teachings would have allowed Bianco's method to manage separately electronic image files and their metadata files.

11. As per dependent claims 9 and 21, Bianco teaches the claimed, task engine module includes a task list including said tasks relating to the electronic image files (Fig. 2B, page 8, paragraph [0107]).

12. As per independent claim 10 and 22, Bianco teaches the electronically displaying files include a single electronically displayable file including a treatment pathway timeline display (page 2, paragraph [0017]). Bianco teaches the claimed, separating one or more electronic image file events related to the set of EIF batches (Fig. 2A, page 5, paragraph [0087]).

Bianco does not teach sorting electronic documents and generating an electronic image file events. However, Miyamoto teaches the claimed "receiving a set of EIF batches extracted from the one or more electronic image files, sending the one or more electronic image file events to a task engine and outputting one or more tasks if said one or more electronic image file events meets said at least one predetermined condition" as a personal computer 2 (Fig. 1) receives an image data file from an electronic still camera (Fig. 1) and records it in a recorder 22 (Fig. 1) (S101). The personal computer 2 (Fig. 1) sorts and arranges the image data file (S102). An operator selects the image data file (S103) and then selects a form data file (S104). Subsequently, the personal computer 2 (Fig. 1) generates a meta-data file

corresponding to the image data file (S105). The image data file includes the names of image data file and form data file. The personal computer 2 (Fig. 1) records the meta-data file and the form data file on a CD 27 (Fig. 1) (S106). When an operator sets the CD 27 (Fig. 1) in the personal computer 2 and designates display of a reproduced image, the reproduced image is presented on a display 25 in a display layout described in the form data file (Abstract). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references because Miyamoto's teachings would have allowed Bianco's method to manage separately electronic image files and their metadata files.

Bianco and Miyamoto do not explicitly teach using a scanning device application for electronic image files. However, Slatter teaches the claimed, the one or more electronic image files received from a scanning application (Fig. 1, col. 6, lines 29-35). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Slatter's teachings would have allowed Bianco's systems and methods to allow electronic documents that are digitally signed to be validated, processed and/or recorded (col. 2, lines 19-21).

13. As per dependent claims 11 and 23, Bianco teaches the claimed, one or more tasks include predetermined task instructions for working each of said one or more tasks (Fig. 2B, page 8, paragraph [0107]).

14. As per dependent claims 12 and 24, Bianco teaches the claimed, task instructions include a predetermined workflow (Fig. 2B, page 5, paragraph [0089]).

15. As per dependent claims 13 and 25, Bianco teaches the claimed, task instructions are adapted to link to said electronic document manager (Fig. 4, page 6, paragraph [0094]).

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments filed on 9/30/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and details as follows:

a) Applicant's arguments regarding 35 U.S.C. rejection of independent claims 1, 10, 14 and 22 states as "the Bianco and Miyamoto references do not teach the system and method of the present application" and "neither Bianco, Miyamoto, nor their combination teach the configuration as taught in the present application."

In response to Applicant's argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees, because, the references do teach every limitation for details see the rejection above. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Conclusion

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sathyanarayan Pannala whose telephone number is (571) 272-4115. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on December 3, 2008 access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sathyanarayan Pannala/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2164

srp
November 30, 2008